



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/764,679

01/26/2004

Eric Watson

303248.01

9444

22971 7590 05/15/2008

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
ONE MICROSOFT WAY  
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

SHECHTMAN, CHERYL MARIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/15/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com  
ntovar@microsoft.com  
a-rydore@microsoft.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/764,679	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WATSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHERYL M. SHECHTMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2163	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHERYL M. SHECHTMAN. (3) JIM STROM.  
 (2) WILSON LEE. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Pub 2005/0004889 by Bailey et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed proposed limitations in view of the prior art. In addition, Mr Strom agreed to clarify that the claimed invention executes a new query, specify what the limitation 'execution of the query' entails, add a processor and database limitation in the system claim 1, indicate the preprocessing aspect of Applicant's invention in the amended claims and indicate that 'preprocessing' can determine query type.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Wilson Lee/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required